



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,192	07/07/2006	Fredrick Michael Vernon	12123-0007	7521

22902 7590 06/14/2011
CLARK & BRODY
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 510
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

GRAHAM, CHANTEL LORAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1775

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/14/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/564,192	Applicant(s) VERNON, FREDRICK MICHAEL	
	Examiner CHANTEL GRAHAM	Art Unit 1775	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1775

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicants' submission filed on 3/23/2011 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being obvious over SIPPEL ET AL. (US PATENT 3795556), in view of VAN GILDER ET AL. (US PATENT 2771458) and as evidence by "COMMERICAL KEROSENE" NOV 1998 and RAM ET AL. (INTRINSIC VISCOSITY OF POLYMER SOLUTIONS) . Hereby referred to as SIPPEL, VAN GILDER, "COMMERICAL KEROSENE" and RAM.

Art Unit: 1775

Regarding claims 21, 23, 24, and 25:

SIPPEL teaches the composition and method of a gelled (**thickening**) composition that comprises liquid hydrocarbon (**liquid hydrocarbons**) fuels such as JP-4 and JP-5 and mixtures thereof (**paraffin and kerosene**); and gelling agents such as polyisobutylene (**medium to high molecular weight polymer**) (**branched chain alkene**) (col. 2 lines 5-27; and EXAMPLES I-X; see also claim 1). SIPPEL also teaches that the composition has improved incendiary characteristics e.g., ability to increase burning time and better dispersion on the target (col. 1 ln 54-56); therefore the Examiner has given “incendiary” the broadest interpretation to include “capable of causing fire”, thereby meeting the claimed limitations **wherein the thickened liquid hydrocarbon fuel oil provides improved adhesion to and absorption of fuel on charcoal and enhanced burning time and burn rates**, and burden shifts to Applicants to establish evidence to the contrary or evidence of criticality.

SIPPEL also teaches that the composition has improved incendiary characteristics e.g., ability to **increase burning time and better dispersion on the target** (col. 1 ln 54-56). Although the property of barbecue lighting fuel is not explicitly disclosed in SIPPEL, it is well within the scope of SIPPEL as taught by VAN GILDER with the disclosure that the solutions produced are useful for many purposes such as **adhesives**, impregnating materials, dipping or spreading cements, **coating compositions (applying the thickened liquid hydrocarbon fuel oil to the charcoal in the barbeque for lighting of the charcoal)** (**further comprising lighting the charcoal using the thickened liquid hydrocarbon fuel oil**), binders when mixed; these solutions generally impart more than one property or function to the composition as taught in VAN GILDER.

Art Unit: 1775

VAN GILDER also discloses the use of any liquid hydrocarbon fuel can be used instead of lubricating oils (col. 3 ln 36-50), such as kerosene (col. 3 ln 42); and the use of any rubbery polymer such as polyisobutylene (col. 3 ln 47).

Having the prior art references before the inventors at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for a skilled artisan to modify the process and composition of SIPPEL by incorporating the process and composition of VAN GILDER by using kerosene as the dilute or liquid hydrocarbon of the polymer and paraffin blend if so desired, the motivation to do so as disclosed in VAN GILDER that it would be obvious to make such modifications because any liquid hydrocarbon fuel and rubbery polymer may be used in composition if so desired.

SIPPEL is silent to the properties relating to the claimed flashpoint of kerosene, or that the kerosene is low odor and the molecular weight of polyisobutylene; however these properties are inherently taught by "COMMERICAL KEROSENE" and RAM. The reference establishes that the claimed properties of kerosene can have a flashpoint in the range of 37-65 degrees C (see pg 2 physical properties of "COMMERICAL KEROSENE") and can be a **low odor kerosene**, one skilled in the art could recognized that the properties are the same (i.e. flash point at 65 degrees C for low odor kerosene); and polyisobutylene can have a range of molecular weights of 1.1×10^6 to 6.6×10^6 (pg 60, paragraph EXPERIMENTAL of RAM).

The primary reference teaches a composition that contains the claimed components, with the exception of the claimed properties. The claimed specific properties of the kerosene having a flash point greater than or equal to 62 degree C and that the polymer has a molecular weight in the range of 1.4×10^6 to 2.0×10^6 are known in the art and are clearly

Art Unit: 1775

shown by the secondary references and therefore the use thereof is well within the level of ordinary skill in the art because the primary reference implies that any JP-5, which is known to be kerosene, can be used and polyisobutylene is used as the gelling agent (col. 2 ln 10-20). In other words, the use of any kerosene and polyisobutylene is obvious to the skilled artisan, as shown by the secondary references.

The examiner acknowledges that the teaching references are not related to the subject matter of the primary reference but the examiner has only used these references to establish that the claimed properties of kerosene can have a flashpoint in the range of 37-65 degrees C (see pg 2 physical properties of “COMMERICAL KEROSENE”) and polyisobutylene can have a range of molecular weights of 1.1×10^6 to 6.6×10^6 (pg 60, paragraph EXPERIMENTAL of RAM); such properties are known in the art. In addition, “products of identical compound can not have mutually exclusive properties.” A compound and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical compound, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. See *In re Papesch*, 315 F.2d 381, 391, 137 USPQ 43, 51 (CCPA 1963) (“From the standpoint of patent law, a compound and all its properties are inseparable.”).

Again, “COMMERICAL KEROSENE” and RAM are considered teaching reference, not a modifying reference. See MPEP 2112.

Regarding claim 22:

Modified SIPPEL does not explicitly teach that the kerosene has a concentration of 90 to <100% by weight and the polymer has a concentration of up to 5% by weight; however in view of VAN GILDER does. VAN GILDER discloses solutions of rubbery polymers (**polymer in solid form**) of high molecular weight and to the production of these

Art Unit: 1775

solutions which are homogenous and lump free; in which the polymer may be present in solution less than or more than 1% (col. 1 ln 15-25). VAN GILDER also discloses that the polymer may be dissolved in wax (**paraffin**) prior to being diluted in lubricating oils (**paraffin polyolefin polymers**) (col. 2 ln 59-68). VAN GILDER discloses the use of any liquid hydrocarbon fuel can be used instead of lubricating oils (col. 3 ln 36-50), such as kerosene (col. 3 ln 42); and the use of any rubbery polymer such as polyisobutylene (col. 3 ln 47). The solutions produced are useful for many purposes such as **adhesives**, impregnating materials, dipping or spreading cements, binders when mixed with wood floor, cork, etc. They are also useful as waterproofing materials, **coating compositions**, and the like (**use as a barbecue lighting fuel**) (col. 3 ln 57-61). However, applicant is reminded that intended use has been continuously held not to be germane to determining the patentability of a composition claim (see MPEP 2111.02).

Although VAN GILDER does not specifically teach the concentration of the kerosene, this reference does in fact teach the concentration of polymer present in solution (see disclosure above) and it is the examiner's position that the concentration of polymer being less than or greater than 1% would purport that the concentration of the kerosene would be less than 100% and burden is upon applicants to show evidence otherwise, thereby meeting the claimed limitations of claims 3 and 15. In view of this data, the examiner's position is that the ranges overlap or encompass the claimed ranges. "In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976).

Having the prior art references before the inventors at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for a skilled artisan to modify the process and

Art Unit: 1775

composition of SIPPEL by incorporating the process and composition of VAN GILDER by using kerosene as the dilute or liquid hydrocarbon of the polymer and paraffin blend if so desired, the motivation to do so as disclosed in VAN GILDER that it would be obvious to make such modifications because any liquid hydrocarbon fuel and rubbery polymer may be used in composition if so desired. Although the property of barbecue lighting fuel is not explicitly disclosed in SIPPEL and VAN GILDER, it is well within the scope of SIPPEL and VAN GILDER with the disclosure that the solutions produced are useful for many purposes such as **adhesives**, impregnating materials, dipping or spreading cements, **coating compositions (applying the thickened liquid hydrocarbon fuel oil to the charcoal in the barbeque for lighting of the charcoal) (further comprising lighting the charcoal using the thickened liquid hydrocarbon fuel oil)**, binders when mixed; these solutions generally impart more than one property or function to the composition as taught in VAN GILDER. It has been held that obviousness is not rebutted by merely recognizing additional advantages or latent properties present in the prior art composition. Further, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd.Pat. App. & Inter. 1985)

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 3/23/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on pages 3-6 “Applicant submits that the prior art does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against new claim 21” The Examiner respectfully disagrees and maintains the

Art Unit: 1775

rejection of record. The Examiner further clarified the Office position on the rejection of SIPPEL and VAN GILDER.

SIPPEL teaches the composition and method of a gelled **(thickening)** composition that comprises liquid hydrocarbon **(liquid hydrocarbons)** fuels such as JP-4 and JP-5 and mixtures thereof **(paraffin and kerosene)**; and gelling agents such as polyisobutylene **(medium to high molecular weight polymer) (branched chain alkene)** (col. 2 lines 5-27; and EXAMPLES I-X; see also claim 1). SIPPEL also teaches that the composition has improved incendiary characteristics e.g., ability to increase burning time and better dispersion on the target (col. 1 ln 54-56); therefore the Examiner has given “incendiary” the broadest interpretation to include “capable of causing fire”, thereby meeting the claimed limitations **wherein the thickened liquid hydrocarbon fuel oil provides improved adhesion to and absorption of fuel on charcoal and enhanced burning time and burn rates**, and burden shifts to Applicants to establish evidence to the contrary or evidence of criticality.

SIPPEL also teaches that the composition has improved incendiary characteristics e.g., ability to **increase burning time and better dispersion on the target** (col. 1 ln 54-56). Although the property of barbecue lighting fuel is not explicitly disclosed in SIPPEL, it is well within the scope of SIPPEL as taught by VAN GILDER with the disclosure that the solutions produced are useful for many purposes such as **adhesives**, impregnating materials, dipping or spreading cements, **coating compositions (applying the thickened liquid hydrocarbon fuel oil to the charcoal in the barbeque for lighting of the charcoal) (further comprising lighting the charcoal using the thickened liquid hydrocarbon fuel oil)**, binders when mixed; these solutions generally impart more than one property or function to the composition as taught in VAN GILDER.

Art Unit: 1775

VAN GILDER also discloses the use of any liquid hydrocarbon fuel can be used instead of lubricating oils (col. 3 ln 36-50), such as kerosene (col. 3 ln 42); and the use of any rubbery polymer such as polyisobutylene (col. 3 ln 47).

Having the prior art references before the inventors at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for a skilled artisan to modify the process and composition of SIPPEL by incorporating the process and composition of VAN GILDER by using kerosene as the dilute or liquid hydrocarbon of the polymer and paraffin blend if so desired, the motivation to do so as disclosed in VAN GILDER that it would be obvious to make such modifications because any liquid hydrocarbon fuel and rubbery polymer may be used in composition if so desired.

SIPPEL is silent to the properties relating to the claimed flashpoint of kerosene, or that the kerosene is low odor and the molecular weight of polyisobutylene; however these properties are inherently taught by "COMMERICAL KEROSENE" and RAM. The reference establishes that the claimed properties of kerosene can have a flashpoint in the range of 37-65 degrees C (see pg 2 physical properties of "COMMERICAL KEROSENE") and can be a **low odor kerosene**, one skilled in the art could recognized that the properties are the same (i.e. flash point at 65 degrees C for low odor kerosene); and polyisobutylene can have a range of molecular weights of 1.1×10^6 to 6.6×10^6 (pg 60, paragraph EXPERIMENTAL of RAM).

The primary reference teaches a composition that contains the claimed components, with the exception of the claimed properties. The claimed specific properties of the kerosene having a flash point greater than or equal to 62 degree C and that the polymer has a molecular weight in the range of 1.4×10^6 to 2.0×10^6 are known in the art and are clearly shown by the secondary references and therefore the use thereof is well within the level of ordinary skill in the art because the primary reference implies that any JP-5, which is known to be kerosene, can be used and polyisobutylene is

Art Unit: 1775

used as the gelling agent (col. 2 ln 10-20). In other words, the use of any kerosene and polyisobutylene is obvious to the skilled artisan, as shown by the secondary references.

The examiner acknowledges that the teaching references are not related to the subject matter of the primary reference but the examiner has only used these references to establish that the claimed properties of kerosene can have a flashpoint in the range of 37-65 degrees C (see pg 2 physical properties of “COMMERICAL KEROSENE”) and polyisobutylene can have a range of molecular weights of 1.1×10^6 to 6.6×10^6 (pg 60, paragraph EXPERIMENTAL of RAM); such properties are known in the art. In addition, “products of identical compound can not have mutually exclusive properties.” A compound and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical compound, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. See *In re Papesch*, 315 F.2d 381, 391, 137 USPQ 43, 51 (CCPA 1963) (“From the standpoint of patent law, a compound and all its properties are inseparable.”).

Again, “COMMERICAL KEROSENE” and RAM are considered teaching reference, not a modifying reference. See MPEP 2112.

The Examiner still maintains the position that Applicant has not provided or established evidence to the contrary or evidence of criticality.

The Examiner has also maintained the position that “incendiary” has been given the broadest interpretation to include “capable of causing fire”, thereby meeting the claimed limitations, and burden shifts to Applicants to establish evidence to the contrary or evidence of criticality. Also, a reference is good not only for what it teaches but also for what one of ordinary skill might reasonably infer from the teachings. *In re Opprecht* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (CAFC 1989); *In re Bode* USPQ 12; *In re Lamberti* 192 USPQ 278; *In re Bozdek* 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969); *In re Van Mater* 144 USPQ 421; *In re Jacoby* 135 USPQ 317; *In re LeGrice* 133 USPQ 365; *In re Preda* 159 USPQ

Art Unit: 1775

342 (CCPA 1968). In addition, "A reference can be used for all it realistically teaches and is not limited to the disclosure in its preferred embodiments" See *In re Van Marter*, 144 USPQ 421. A prima facie case of obviousness may be made when chemical processes have very close methods and similar utilities. "An obviousness rejection based on similarity in chemical methods and function entails the motivation of one skilled in the art to make a claimed process, in the expectation that processes having similar methods will produce similar products." *In re Payne*, 606 F.2d 303, 313, 203 USPQ 245, 254 (CCPA 1979) See *In re Papesch*, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) and *In re Dillon*, 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897 (Fed. Cir. 1991) See also MPEP § 2144.08.

The office has clearly established a prima facie case of obviousness as outlined above (i.e. all the claimed components are taught by the references in the claimed processes) and now burden shifts to applicants to establish evidence otherwise or evidence of criticality and they have not shown that any additional methods would be expected to be of similar processes to the evidence of record. This burden is shifted to applicants once a prima facie case of obviousness has been established and as outlined above, one has been established. The Examiner is of the position that the claimed invention would have been obvious because all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. In view of the teachings as set forth above, it is the examiners position that the references reasonably teach or suggest the limitations of the rejected claims.

Applicant argues "The question of obviousness is whether one skill in the art would use the composition of SIPPEL to light charcoal in a barbeque." Again the Examiner maintains the position that one of ordinary skilled in the art would use the solution of SIPPEL and VAN GILDER if the skilled oil

Art Unit: 1775

formulator so desired. SIPPEL also teaches that the composition has improved incendiary characteristics e.g., ability to **increase burning time and better dispersion on the target** (col. 1 ln 54-56). Although the property of barbecue lighting fuel is not explicitly disclosed in SIPPEL, it is well within the scope of SIPPEL as taught by VAN GILDER with the disclosure that the solutions produced are useful for many purposes such as **adhesives**, impregnating materials, dipping or spreading cements, **coating compositions (applying the thickened liquid hydrocarbon fuel oil to the charcoal in the barbeque for lighting of the charcoal) (further comprising lighting the charcoal using the thickened liquid hydrocarbon fuel oil)**, binders when mixed; these solutions generally impart more than one property or function to the composition as taught in VAN GILDER. VAN GILDER also discloses the use of any liquid hydrocarbon fuel can be used instead of lubricating oils (col. 3 ln 36-50), such as kerosene (col. 3 ln 42); and the use of any rubbery polymer such as polyisobutylene (col. 3 ln 47). Therefore, having the prior art references before the inventors at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for a skilled artisan to modify the process and composition of SIPPEL by incorporating the process and composition of VAN GILDER by using kerosene as the dilute or liquid hydrocarbon of the polymer and paraffin blend if so desired, the motivation to do so as disclosed in VAN GILDER that it would be obvious to make such modifications because any liquid hydrocarbon fuel and rubbery polymer may be used in composition if so desired.

Applicant is also reminded that intended use has been continuously held not to be germane to determining the patentability of a composition claim (see MPEP 2111.02). If the body of a claim fully and intrinsically sets forth all of the limitations of the claimed invention, and the preamble merely states, for example, the purpose or intended use of the invention, rather than any distinct definition of any of the claimed invention's limitations, then the preamble is not considered a

Art Unit: 1775

limitation and is of no significance to claim construction. *Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 182 F.3d 1298, 1305, 51 USPQ2d 1161, 1165 (Fed. Cir. 1999). See also *Rowe v. Dror*, 112 F.3d 473, 478, 42 USPQ2d 1550, 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (“where a patentee defines a structurally complete invention in the claim body and uses the preamble only to state a purpose or intended use for the invention, the preamble is not a claim limitation”); *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d at 152, 88 USPQ2d at 480-81 (preamble is not a limitation where claim is directed to a product and the preamble merely recites a property inherent in an old product defined by the remainder of the claim); *STX LLC v. Brine*, 211 F.3d 588, 591, 54 USPQ2d 1347, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (holding that the preamble phrase “which provides improved playing and handling characteristics” in a claim drawn to a head for a lacrosse stick was not a claim limitation). Compare *Jansen v. Rexall Sundown, Inc.*, 342 F.3d 1329, 1333-34, 68 USPQ2d 1154, 1158 (Fed. Cir. 2003)

As set forth above, the preamble language “a barbeque lighting fuel” is a statement of intended use which carries no patentable weight in composition claims. (See MPEP 2111.02)

Applicant argues “*In fact, Van Gilder and Sippel are unrelated...*”

Examiner respectfully disagrees for at least the reason set forth above. Additionally, the Examiner’s rationale to support a conclusion that the claims would have been obvious is that all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

The office has clearly established a *prima facie* case of obviousness as outlined above (i.e. all the claimed components are taught by the references in the claimed processes) and now burden shifts to applicants to establish evidence otherwise or evidence of criticality and they have not

Art Unit: 1775

shown that any additional methods would be expected to be of similar processes to the evidence of record. This burden is shifted to applicants once a prima facie case of obviousness has been established and as outlined above, in which one has been established. In view of the teachings as set forth above, it is the examiners position that the references reasonably teach or suggest the limitations of the rejected claims.

Conclusion

5. This is a continued examination of applicant's earlier Application No. 10564192. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application.

6. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHANTEL GRAHAM whose telephone number is (571)270-5563. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 1775

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Marcheschi can be reached on 571-272-1374. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CHANTEL GRAHAM/
Examiner, Art Unit 1775

/Ellen M McAvoy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1771